

REMARKS

In the Action, the Examiner has requested that the claims in the application be restricted to one of the following species:

- (a) wherein the product is fluid-filled,
- (b) wherein the product is hollow.

The Applicant has reviewed the application and claims and believes that the claims presently on file in the case, namely claims 1-53, can be divided into these two species as follows:

- (a) claims 12-32, 34-39,
- (b) claims 1-11, 33, 40-52.

In this regard, the Examiner in the Office Action indicated that “48” claims were in the case. However, in the Amendment and Request for Reconsideration filed on September 17, 2007, the Applicant submitted 52 claims. Thus, it is believed that there are 52 claims presented and pending in the case at this time and the Examiner is requested to confirm this.

Finally, in the response to the Examiner's request for election of one species to examine at this time, the Applicant hereby elects the claims of group (b), namely claims 1-11, 33 and 40-52.

This election is being made with traverse since it is believed that all of the claims can be and should be examined together.

The Examiner is also directed to the Terminal Disclaimer that was filed with the September 17, 2007, Amendment. Earlier, that is before the application lapsed and was reinstated, claims 1-22 and 33-39 were rejected on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of commonly-owned U.S. Patent No. 6,716,387. The Terminal Disclaimer overcame that rejection. Also, the Examiner is reminded that claims 23-52 were allowed earlier as filed in the original application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

John A. Artz, Reg. No. 25,824
Dickinson Wright PLLC
38525 Woodward Avenue, Suite 2000
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-5092
(248) 433-7200 (Telephone)
(248) 433-7274 (Facsimile)

Dated: May 30, 2008